DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 562 SP 030 732

AUTHOR Ishler, Peggy
TITLE A Report on Successful Teacher Induction Programs: The Whys, Whats, and Wherefores for Texas.
PUB DATE 21 Oct 88
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Texas Conference on Teacher Education (41st, Dallas, TX, October 21, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Mentors; Program Effectiveness; *Released Time; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Teacher Induction

ABSTRACT

This paper, specifically addressed to teacher education in Texas, discusses teacher induction programs. A review is presented of some successful induction programs around the country and similarities and differences in some of the salient features of entry-level programs. The variety of roles institutions of higher education can play in such programs is discussed. It is pointed out that these successful programs have many things in common--collaboration, training trainers, caring support, separating assistance from assessment, and teachers teaching teachers. It is emphasized that Texas, which requires less than 20 hours of professional training for their teachers, needs strong induction programs, and recommendations are made on where higher education might become involved in Texas teacher induction. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED301562

# A Report on Successful Teacher Induction Programs: The Whys, Whats, and Wherefores for Texas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Peggy Ishler

Bowling Green State University

Chair, ATE Commission on Induction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Ishler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The most significant change for teacher education emerging from the educational reform movement of the eighties is the entry-year movement. This movement is considered by some to be the most important change in teacher training since the advent of student teaching because it provides the bridge from preservice to inservice staff development. The advent of induction programs acknowledges that becoming a teacher is a slow developmental process that takes years of training and experience.

Today I would like to present to you a review of some successful induction programs around the country in order to provide you with an insight into what successful programs look like and how they might work in Texas. I will focus my remarks around three W's -- the why of induction, what do representative model programs look like, and where might higher education become involved in collaborative approaches to entry-year programs in Texas.

## Why Induction

Texas particularly needs the induction year. With the infamous Senate Bill 994 that limits preservice teacher education to 18 hours, Texas has the dubious distinction of joining the few states that require less than 20 hours of professional training for their

SP030732

teachers. In my state of Ohio, teacher education programs require a minimum of 24 professional education credits (Bowling Green State University requires 32), 600 hours of clinical and field experience, and an additional concentration of 20 hours in a discipline for an elementary major.

Is it not ironic that at this time when the knowledge base of teacher education is expanding so rapidly, as can be seen in the monumental third edition of the Handbook of Research on Teaching, that Texas limits the opportunity of its beginning teachers to learn that knowledge. Tom Good and Jere Brophy (1986) in their chapter in that handbook on effective teaching say that we now know that certain instructional behaviors can make a difference in student achievement. However, preservice education will barely have time to introduce this instructional knowledge, let alone coach students to a reflective application level.

Yes, the only positive note in your mandated changes is the ruling on the establishing of entry-year programs. Without a doubt the entry year will have to assume responsibilities for teaching and developing many of the instructional skills required by the Texas Teacher Appraisal System and the knowledge necessary to pass the Examination for Certification of Educators in Texas. In a constricted time frame of 18 credit hours plus 10 weeks of student teaching, a beginning teacher barely will be beyond the awareness level in development and will need considerable structured training as well as individualized support in order to have the skills and resources needed to teach today's student.

So the need for induction programs in Texas is very clear. Induction programs will have to continue the professional education necessary for beginning teachers to not only pass the state assessment screening but to meet the challenges of the classroom. This means it will be essential for higher education and school districts to work together to develop an articulated induction training model as well as to provide for individualized support within that model.

Other reasons why Texas needs induction include the large number of beginning teachers required each year. The projection for next year is that 12,000 teachers will be needed in this state. According to Schlecty and Vance (1983), 30% of beginning teachers leave the profession during the first three years. Evidence suggests that the most academically talented leave in the greatest numbers. During the first seven years, 40 to 50% of teachers leave the profession. Given these statistics, one can see the terrible drain of wasted talents and money that results when many of these beginners leave after the first few years.

However, from the information reported by the few induction programs that are evaluating their own effectiveness, retention rates show definite improvement through entry-year programs. For example, in the University of Alabama, Birmingham First-Year Teacher Pilot Program (Blackburn, 1977), only 4 out of 100 teachers receiving induction support did not teach the following year as compared to 20 in the control group of 100 teachers not receiving support. Ohio County Schools in West Virginia reported that since the inception of the Teacher Induction Program, 73 teachers have been inducted and of

that number, 68 continue to hold teaching positions in the county (Marockie, 1988).

Other induction whys include improving teaching, meeting the many needs of beginning teachers, and handling teacher concerns that must be addressed before teachers can move along the teacher developmental continuum, as defined by Glickman (1985), Fuller (1969), and Hunt (1983), etc. The whys of induction are becoming well known and acknowledged as the induction movement spreads throughout the country.

## What's Happening and What Do Successful Programs Look Like

Much has been happening in induction over the past eight years. Induction, as many of the educational reforms, has been initiated and spread at the state level. Considering that the first state initiative was in 1980, the movement appears to be growing like wild fire. Fourteen states now have mandated programs including twelve of which tie induction to certification (NASDTEC, 1988). Most states provide some financial support for state initiated programs. Florida gives $1.70 per full-time equivalent; Washington allocates $1.5 million for total projects in their state; Kentucky provides $1700 per beginning teacher, and Georgia $100. States receiving no funding include Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. Here in Texas you await the decision on the amount of financial support forthcoming from the State. The decision will be known in January.

Induction costs money. North Carolina estimated that $1400 per beginning teacher is necessary to run a successful program. North Carolina was allotted $100 (Hawk & Robards, 1987). As mentioned previously, other states have allocated no state money at all. In

programs that have received little or no support money, districts are not able to provide released time and substitutes to free mentors to work in classrooms with beginners, or to fund a number of uncontracted days for mentor training--some key features in quality programs.

Most states do provide some support for induction programs. The movement continues with 21 additional states planning or piloting programs at this time (Hawk & Robards, 1987).

What do successful programs look like? Some of the key components are the following:

1. A strong support component delivered by a designated mentor or a support team.
2. A program based on emerging needs of individual teachers as well as a structured training component.
3. A training and support program for the experienced professionals who serve as sources of help for the beginning teachers.
4. A separation of the assistance component from the assessment component.
5. An integration of the induction program into the total staff development program of the district.
6. Collaborative efforts among the local education associations, higher education, and the state department of education in planning and training.
7. Support from the district and the state to provide released time and training for both mentors and beginning teachers.

Now, let's look at some specific models. All of these models were selected to be presented during the showcase sessions at the National Leadership Academy on Planning and Implementation of

Induction and Beginning Teacher Support Programs sponsored by the Association of Teacher Educators and Rhode Island College, Providence, Rhode Island, June 10-12, 1988. The models I am going to share with you are collaborative models that bring together IHEs (institutions of higher education) and school districts in cooperative efforts to support beginning teachers.

Training Model

The Wake County Public Schools (McNair et al., 1988) in Raleigh, North Carolina, provide an excellent training model which links induction with staff development. Planned in conjunction with North Carolina State University's Department of Curriculum and Instruction, the program is a "state of the art" training for teachers who supervise novice teachers (student teachers and beginning teachers). It consists of a two-semester sequence of educational theory and practice, supervision and coaching, followed by a practicum during which teachers practice their new supervisory skills in a supportive atmosphere. Through the practicum, the teachers work with student teachers, beginning teachers, or colleagues. Teachers also are trained in communication skills and the impact of these skills on the effectiveness of the mentor-mentee relationship and classroom instruction. The curriculum training component is based on research and theory related to the growth and development of adults. It includes the work of the Sprinthalls using a teacher cognitive developmental teaching/learning framework. The training is conducted by classroom teachers who have participated in the university's three-semester sequence which includes the teacher serving as a mentor

under supervision, and an internship during which mentors teach the training program.

Evaluation data collected confirms the success of the program. It recently received the AACTE outstanding program award.

Indiana Collaborative Model

Indiana (Evans, 1987) has mandated the Beginning Teacher Internship Program which requires the beginning teacher to serve an internship with a full-day teaching assignment and regular pay. An experienced teacher, who also carries a full-time teaching assignment, serves as a mentor to observe, conference, guide and support on a regular basis. Mentors receive $600 from the state. The principal is responsible for evaluating the beginner on the Beginning Teacher Assessment Inventory. The beginning teacher may elect a university advisor who receives travel expense reimbursement to help that beginning teacher.

Project Credit (Henry, 1988) is an award winning teacher induction program of mentor, university, and peer support for first-year teachers. The program, used in 10 school districts in west-central Indiana, was jointly developed by these districts and Indiana State University to link the university and the schools in the preparation of teachers, improvement of skills of first-year teachers, and inservice of teachers. A steering committee composed of three public school teachers, two public school administrators, and two university professors developed basic procedures and guidelines. Each beginning teacher intern was assigned a mentor in the building who was judged to be an outstanding teacher. University supervisors provided assistance through monthly site visits, classroom observations, and

consultations with mentor, intern, and principal. In addition, a group of university consultants assisted in sessions on human relations skills, classroom management, etc. Beginning teachers and mentors were brought together in a monthly dinner seminar and also by receiving a newsletter. Since participating schools only had one or two teachers, the peer support component was important.

Several features of Project Credit have been incorporated into the induction law enacted by the 1987 Indiana legislature. Also, the program was selected as the winner of the 1988 Distinguished Program in Teacher Education award given by the Association of Teacher Educators.

Another Model Collaboration Plan

The Albuquerque Public Schools and the University of New Mexico (Odell, 1988) have formed a model collaboration to provide all beginning elementary school teachers in the city system with classroom induction support. The program has four components: 1) A "no additional cost" university/public school teacher exchange that releases 17 veteran teachers from classroom duty in order to provide either preservice teacher support or induction support to beginning teachers as clinical support teachers. 2) In exchange, the university replaces these teachers with 26 graduate interns who will staff 26 classrooms as first-year teachers. These interns are also working on their MA degrees and receiving a tuition waiver and a stipend equal to one half a beginning teacher's salary. 3) The model also contains a clinical support teacher component from the above teachers in component (1). 4) Beginning teachers receive inservice training in voluntary workshops.

This collaborative program is described as a "no extra cost," collaborative, induction program that provides support to beginning teachers while offering formal and informal education to all program participants.

State Piloting Five Models

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has piloted five models of induction (Lind, 1988) for the Wisconsin Entry-Year Assistance Program. The purpose of piloting several models of induction as well as a performance assessment instrument is to identify the most effective models to use state-wide. Models include the University-Centered Induction Model--directed by a university and requires a three-credit course be taken by the first-year teacher and the mentor. In addition, the first-year teacher is supervised by the university supervisor. The Residency Model is also developed and directed by the university. First-year teacher assumes a lighter teaching load and 2/3 salary, and carries 12 graduate credits. The teacher is also assigned a mentor teacher. District-centered model is developed by an advising council in a local district. A mentor is assigned to a first-year teacher, monthly seminars and informal social gatherings are held. The building administrator evaluates the beginning teacher at the end of the year. There is minimal university involvement in this model. University/District Cooperative Plan is developed jointly. University faculty serve as consultants for the mentors and beginning teachers. No college credit is involved. Consortium Model is located on a university campus and is administered by a consortium of districts. Four master teachers are granted leave from their district to work in the Regional Staff Development Center.

These liaison teachers assist teachers. Beginning teachers are paired with a mentor in their building and a building supervisor. Beginning teachers attend seminars at the entry but do not have to enroll in graduate classes.

Tying Preservice and Inservice Together

The Arizona Teacher Residency Program (Cruz et al., 1988) at North Arizona University provides an example of how preservice and inservice can work together in teacher training. The Arizona Teacher Residency Assessment instrument is used to document the development of skills among students during pre-service performance-based activities and during student teaching. The information gained provides feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher preparation program and prepares student teachers for the assessments they will experience as novice teachers. Cooperating teachers are provided training in the use of the instrument.

The Maricopa County Teacher Redesign Project at Arizona State University in Tempe offers teacher residency training to mentors and beginning teachers (residents) as well as cooperating teachers. This project serves as a research center for mentors and residual teachers to evaluate the training sessions and the mentoring process. The performance of recent graduates provides feedback on preservice training, and observational data is returned to participating school districts to help districts identify specific staff development needs.

Use of Instructional Teachers

An exciting model of university-public school collaboration is the California State University, Chico's Induction for the Beginning Teacher Program (Bernhardt, 1988). This model would hold some

interest for a state as large as Texas because this unique program reaches teachers in 14 counties in a 36,000 square mile rural service area through instructional television. Each beginning teacher is part of a teaching team with a trained peer coach and experienced teacher of the same grade level and content area. Teaching teams work independently and are brought together by county, as a seminar group under the leadership of a facilitator--an experienced teacher trained to facilitate once a month for televised seminars.

Facilitators and peer coaches participate in a one-week intensive training in peer coaching; teacher observation; development of beginning teachers, etc. Follow-up training occurs once a month by instructional television and for two days on campus during the year.

The televised monthly seminars, delivered by terrestrial microwaves, features one-way video and two-way audio interaction. This medium enables all teachers to work with experts on professional development topics. Following each seminar, each teaching team formulates a plan of action related to the seminar's topics and the needs of the beginning teacher. A quarterly newsletter consisting of examples of the instructional television services helps link the beginning teachers and mentors together.

University credit is offered to all participants. Peer coaches earn credit for training and practice in peer observation. Beginning teachers earn credits in advanced teaching that can be used to meet the California Professional Growth Requirement hours for renewal of certification.

All of these programs include collaboration between the school and the university and, in some cases, the department of education.

The role of higher education is varied, as will be examined in the last section of my presentation.

## Where Might Higher Education Become Involved in Texas Induction

The latest report from the 18 member Advisory Committee on Teacher Induction is that the Committee will recommend that each district be required to provide its own program or form collaborative groups with other districts, and/or institutions of higher education. A mentor is to be assigned to each beginning teacher. A certain number of days will be available for released time for the beginning teachers and the mentor to use together or separately for professional growth. Training is to be provided for both mentors and beginners.

Considering the number and size of school districts in Texas, over 1,100 districts, consortiums of districts within counties, or county-wide induction systems could be formed with or without the involvement of IHEs. With IHEs involved, an induction center could be located on college campuses as in the Arizona Residency Model and in some of the Wisconsin models, where college faculty deliver the training seminars for both beginners and mentors and provide college credit. A model could be established such as that in Wake County, North Carolina, in which trainees are instructed in an extensive three-semester program that equips teachers to be both cooperating teachers and mentors.

To cover the vast number of miles in a district or a collaborative unit, instructional television could be used to provide seminar classes for beginning teachers and training sessions for support people such as in the California, Chico Model previously

mentioned. Another excellent use of modern technology is to establish a computer network to assist beginners. Computer linkage is set up between a district and an IHE that enables a beginning teacher to receive feedback and information from teacher education faculty or designated master teachers. This type of information system is particularly helpful to address the beginning teacher's need of learning about resources, center ideas, activities, and materials. Also, interactive videodiscs are now available for instructional training seminars such as "Improving Teacher Effectiveness" from MECC Special Products, Minnesota.

Another effective support linkage for a large district is the use of a toll free number service staffed by master teachers or teacher education faculty in the evenings to answer questions, give support, and provide a sympathetic, impartial ear.

The district consortiums could be run by advisory councils that include higher education faculty. Higher education faculty could be called upon to handle program evaluation and research, ripe areas for graduate study and research projects.

In review, the variety of roles higher education can play, as described through the examples of the programs included in this paper, range from no involvement--as in two of the Wisconsin models--to induction programs university-based and university controlled and delivered. Within that range a number of possibilities exist including the following:

1. IHE faculty can play a consulting role to a district program by serving on advisory boards, and being on-call as consultants to assist teachers.

2. IHEs can cooperatively design orientation programs and activities, design evaluation approaches, plan programs, etc.
3. IHE faculty can be the trainers for the district or consortium personnel who will administer the programs or assist beginning teachers. University credit can be attached to this training.
4. IHE faculty can offer courses designed for the beginning teacher.
5. IHEs can set up operations for a district or consortium such as computer-based networks, instructional television seminars, and toll-free telephone assistance.
6. IHEs can provide the research and evaluation assistance necessary to move Texas' programs forward.
7. IHEs can collaborate with districts to form alternative certification programs such as internships leading to a masters degree.
8. Faculty in the area of counseling, psychology, and social work can be involved in group counseling with new teachers or in providing workshops for school personnel.
9. The least assumed and efficient role for IHEs is that of serving as a field supervisor of a beginning teacher or as a mentor on a one-to-one basis. IHEs are more effective at the group level.

The question of how higher education people will be paid for their participation can be examined through an ATE survey (Johnston & Key, 1987) that reported that IHE faculty generally participated on an overload basis. Reduction of load for faculty involvement was occasionally used. Being given extra pay was reported by small numbers of institutions. Faculty generally volunteered for the assignments. Surprisingly, almost 40% of IHE faculty involvement

reported was from faculty outside the college or department of education. School districts paid IHEs for their instructional services or paid for the courses teachers took as part of the induction training, since funded states compensated school districts directly.

According to the latest NASDTEC reports (Mastain, 1988), state funding of IHE's involvement is minimal around the county at this time. Oklahoma is the exception with $500 paid to teacher consultants and $1200 to IHE for each beginning teacher supported. Kentucky partially reimburses IHEs for travel expenses and staff time.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, I want to emphasize again that Texas desperately needs strong induction programs to guide the thousands of beginning teachers over the next few years so that the best will continue in teaching and professional development beyond those dangerous dropout first years. Strong induction programs require money for mentor compensation; for released time for observation conferencing; for mentor training, inductee training, administration and staff training on beginning teacher needs and the induction program; and for the acquisition of resources for beginning teachers and mentors. Without funding, the aforementioned components of successful programs are drastically reduced or eliminated. Induction becomes reduction--programs limited to the typical initial orientation day and the pairing of the beginning teacher with a buddy--the type of programs reported by many districts claiming to have induction programs in the 1986 ATE national survey.

Therefore, you will need to work hard to educate your legislators to the necessity for solid financial support to promote quality retention in the teaching force.

To summarize the three Ws focus of my talk, I have examined the why of induction for Texas, what do successful programs look like, where institutions of higher education can play a role in induction programs. The key words that emerge from these successful models are collaboration, training trainers, caring support, separating assistance from assessment, and teachers teaching teachers. Although much remains to be learned about the operation and impact of this new phase of teacher training, the potential exists for developing more effective teachers through continuous training that links preservice training induction to staff development in a life-long pursuit of teaching excellence.

1/14

## References

Bernhardt, V. (1988). Induction for the beginning teacher program. California State University, Chico, California. Presentation made at the ATE National Leadership Academy on Planning and Implementing Induction and Beginning Teacher Support Programs at Providence, Rhode Island, June 10-12.

Blackburn, J. (1977). The first-year teacher: Perceived needs, intervention strategies and results. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC No. ED 135 768)

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In W. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Cruz, B., Anderson, G., Lawhead, D., Nelson, C., & Weber, B. (1988). Arizona teacher residency project. Presentation made at the ATE National Leadership Academy on Planning and Implementing Induction and Beginning Teacher Support Programs at Providence, Rhode Island, June 10-12.

Evans, H. Supt. (1988). Beginning teacher internship handbook. Department of Education, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 207-226.

Glickman, C. (1985). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, pp. 43-73.

Hawk, P., & Robards, S. (1987). Statewide teacher induction programs in Brooks (Ed.) Teacher Induction--A New Beginning. Association of Teacher Educators, Reston, Virginia, pp. 33-45.

Henry, M. (1988). Certification renewal experiences designed to improve teaching: Report of a multiple-support system for first-year teachers in Indiana. Presentation made at the ATE National leadership Academy on Planning and Implementing Induction and Beginning Teacher Support Programs, at Providence, Rhode Island, June 10-12.

Hunt, D. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and developmental tool. Academy of Management Review, 8(3), 475-485.

Johnston, J., & Kay, R. (1987). The role of institutions of higher education in professional teacher induction, in Brooks, D. (Ed.) Teacher Induction: A New Beginning. Association of Teacher Educators, Reston, Virginia, pp. 45-56.

Lind, K. (1988). Wisconsin's program for mentoring teachers, Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin. Presentation made at the ATE National Leadership Academy on Planning and Implementing Induction and Beginning Teacher Support Programs at Providence, Rhode Island.

Marockie, M. (1988). Teacher induction programs: A three year orientation and support system for beginning teachers. Paper presented at the National Leadership Academy on Planning and Implementing Induction and Beginning Teacher Support Programs, sponsored by the Association of Teacher Educators and Rhode Island College, Rhode Island.

Mastain, R. (Ed.). (1988). Manual on certification and preparation of educational personnel in the United States. Compiled by National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, pp. 01-018.

McNair, V., McGee, N., Reiman, H. J. (1988). Sweet rejuvination: Linking inservice and teacher induction. The induction program for the Wake County Public School System, Raleigh, North Carolina. Presentation made at the ATE National leadership Academy on Planning and Implementing Induction and Beginning Teacher Support Programs, at Providence, Rhode Island, June 10-12.

Odell, S. (1986). A model university-school system collaboration in teacher induction. Kappa Delta Pi Record, Summer, pp. 120-121.

Schlecty, P., & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. The Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 468-487.

1/14